World Trade Center East

Two Seaport Lane

Suite 300

Boston, MA 02210-2028

617-946-4800

fax 617-946-4801

www.seyfarth.com

BRUSSELS

WASHINGTON, D.C.

SAN FRANCISCO

SACRAMENTO

NEW YORK

Writer's direct phone (617) 946-4989

Writer's e-mail crobertson@seyfarth.com

February 23, 2006

## VIA HAND DELIVERY

Honorable George A. O'Toole United States District Court District of Massachusetts John Joseph Moakley U.S. Courthouse One Courthouse Way Boston, MA 02210

Re:

Federal Trade Commission v. Direct Marketing Concepts, Inc., et al.

C.A. No. 04-CV-11136 GAO

Dear Judge O'Toole:

We write to advise the Court of correspondence we received from the Federal Trade Commission on February 17, 2006. In that correspondence, the Commission staff notified us that our Opposition to the Commission's Motion for Summary Judgment contained an error. Specifically, we indicated in our Memorandum of Law and our Statement of Disputed Facts that the Commission had not previously identified Commission employee Stefano Sciolli as a witness in this case, "as an expert or otherwise." That statement is only true in part.

It appears that on February 9, 2005, the Commission staff did identify Mr. Sciolli as a lay witness under Rule 26(a)(1)(A). This disclosure, however, confirms that the Commission never identified Mr. Sciolli as an expert witness under Rule 26(a)(2), despite the fact that he is an economist whose sole purpose in testifying is to opine on certain data provided by the DMC Defendants. This testimony, which is based upon Mr. Sciolli's technical and specialized knowledge as an economist, is inadmissible. See Advisory Committee Notes, Fed. R. Evid. 701 ("By channeling testimony that is actually expert testimony to Rule 702, the amendment also ensures that a party will not evade the expert witness disclosure requirements set forth in Fed.R.Civ.P. 26") (citing United States v. Figueroa-Lopez, 125 F.3d 1241, 1246 (9th Cir. 1997) (law enforcement agents testifying regarding defendant's conduct could not testify as lay witnesses)). The DMC Defendants, therefore, believe that the testimony of Mr. Sciolli should be disregarded by the Court.



Honorable George A. O'Toole February 23, 2005 Page 2

Nonetheless, as set forth more fully in the DMC Defendants' Opposition, if the Court is inclined to consider Mr. Sciolli's testimony, that testimony on its face creates numerous issues of fact concerning the DMC Defendants' sales practices that cannot be resolved on summary judgment, requiring denial of the Commission's motion.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

SEYFARTH SHAW-LLP

Christopher F. Robertson

cc:

Heather Hippsley, Esq. Peter S. Brooks, Esq.